(iii) Widening and upgrading miles 77-1 to 82—2 of Mangalore-Baindur Section.

(iv) Constructing Uppunda River Bridge on Mangalore-Baindur Road (only some material collected).

(v) Constructing a Bridge across the Kalyanapur River (only some material collected).

(vi) Constructing a Bridge across the Mabukal River (only some material collected).

No work was completed during 1957-58.

Grouping of Abkari Shops by the Deputy Excise Commissioner of Gulbarga.

Q.—2618. Sri V. KUMAR NAIK (Shorapur).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Deputy Excise Commissioner of Gulbarga resorted to grouping of former groups of Abkari shops without obtaining competent sanction from the Excise Commissioner;

(*b*) if so, the number of groups formed together with the reasons therefor ?

A.—Sri N. RACHAIAH (Minister for Social Welfare, Excise and Prohibition).—

(*a*) No.

(*b*) Does not arise in view of answer to (*a*).

Reservation of Posts for Backward Class people in the Offices of Belgaum District.

Q.—2760. Sri N. O. SAMAJI (Belgaum II).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether any posts are reserved for Backward Class people and for the minorities in the Commissioner's Office, Collector's Office, Regional Office, State Bank, Development Board and in each taluk office of Belgam District ;

(*b*) if not, the reasons therefor ?

A.—Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).-

(*a*) & (*b*) The State Bank is not under the State Government. As regards other offices, reservation of posts is not made from office to office. But reservation for Backward Classes, Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes exists in respect of initial recruitment to all Government services and in respect of promotion by selection from Non-Gazetted to Gazetted posts. It is 15 per cent for Scheduled Castes, 3 per cent for Scheduled Tribes and 57 per cent for other Backward Classes.

Panel of Chairmen.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Under rule 6 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly, the following members form Panel of Chirmen :

1. Sri K. M. Deviah
2. Sri S. D. Kothawale
3. Sri C. K. Rajiah Shetty
4. Sri Kuma[illegible] Naik.

Adjournment Motions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have received certain adjournment motions. They would be taken up tomorrow.

Members' representations.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA (Hospet) .— May I rise on a point of information, Sir? Sir, questions were submitted as long ago as February 1957 and answers to them have not come before this Assembly as yet. May I know if any plan has been evolved to bring answers to these questions to the floor of this Assembly? Would the answers be furnished according to the chronological order in which they were received by the Speaker or the Secretary of the Legislature?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes. I will come to that. Sri Kenchappa.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ (ಹಿರಿಯೂರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಮೊದಲು ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ಬೇರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳವರು ಇದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ಹೊಸ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಆ ವಿಷಯ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಒಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯು ರಾಜಿನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗುವಾಗ ಹಾಗೂ ಬೇರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಬಂದಾಗ ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಒಂದು ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಅನ್ನು ಈ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯ ಅಧಿವೇಶನವು ಅಕಸ್ಮಾತ್ತಾಗಿ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಆಗಿದ್ದ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಳ ಹೋಗಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿತು ಎಂದು ಅನಂತರ ನಾವು ಪೇಪರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದಿದೆವು. ಈಗ ಬೇರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಕಳೆದ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಮೆ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಆಗಿ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲಗಳು ಬಂದು ಹೋಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖಂಡತ್ವ ಉಳಿದಿಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬ ಸಂಶಯ ನಮಗೆ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹಾಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಂದು ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖಂಡತ್ವವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಲು ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. I cannot allow such things here. I cannot allow anything said against any party or organisation. We are not concerned with such things in this House. That is a concern of the parties. It is an internal affair with which neither the House nor any member should be concerned in this House. If the Hon'ble Member wants to know if a convention exists whereby resigning Minister should make a statement to the House, I will examine it and give a reply.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಒಂದು ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಳ ಹೋಗಿ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಳ ಬಂದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಿದೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಆದನಂತರ ಈ ದಿನದ ನಿಯಮಿತ ಕೆಲಸವು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಇಂಥ ದೊಂದು ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯದ ಸಂಗತಿ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಯೆಂದರೆ, ನಾವು ಹಿಂದಿನ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿವೇಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಇದ್ದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಇರುವ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಆಗುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು ಬಂತು ? ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಂಟಾದ ಯಾವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮೊದಲಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಳ ಹೋಯಿತು ? ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ದೇಶದ ಕನ್ಸ್ಟ್ರೂಡಿಯನ್ಸ್ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಳ ಬರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು ? ಬಹು ಮತವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವ ಮೂಲಕ ಈ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬಹುಮತವಿದೆ. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಅಹಿತ ಉಂಟಾದ ಕಾರಣವಿರ ಬಹುದೇ ! ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಆ ಕಾರಣವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದ್ದರೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅನುಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣ ಬಂತು, ಯಾವಕಾರಣಕ್ಕೆಹೋದರು, ಇವರು ಬಂದರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇದೆ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಹಾಗೆ ತಾವು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಅಥವಾ ಅವರೇ ಅದನ್ನೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡಾದರೂ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು. ಕಾರಣ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗದೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದವರು ಹೋಗಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ತುಂಬಾ ಅಲ್ಲೋಲ ಕಲ್ಲೋಲವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ಮನೆತನದ ಹವ್ಯಾಸವಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶದ ಒಂದು ಆಸ್ತಿಯಂತೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ವರ್ತನೆಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು, ಅವಶ್ಯಕ. ಆ ಆಸ್ತಿಯ ಭಾವನೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು ಅವರುಗಳು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ ದೇಶದ ಒಂದು ಸಂಪತ್ತು ಅವರು ಆಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ನನಗಾದರೂ ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ, ಹೋದರು ಇವರು ಬಂದರು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚೆನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗೆ...

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY (Bangalore South).—Sri K. Kenchappa is demanding some . . . . .

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA—I do not yield.

ಈಗ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲ ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಒತ್ತಿ ಒತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲವನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಅವರು ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲವನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲ ಹೋಗಿ ಹೊಸ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲ ಬಂದಿರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದು ಏಕೆ ಹೋಯಿತು, ಹೊಸ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲರಚನೆ ಆಯಿತು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಹಕ್ಕು ನಮಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಉಚಿತವಾದುದು. ಈಗ ಬರ್ಮಾದಲ್ಲೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಪಾಕ್ಇಸ್ತಾನದಲ್ಲೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲ ಹೋಗಿರುವಾಗ, ಮಾರ್ಷಲ್‌ಲಾ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದಿರುವಾಗ, ಏಕೆ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದರು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನ್ಯಷ್ಟೀಕರಣಮಾಡಿ ಪ್ರೆಸಿಡೆಂಟರೂ ಕೂಡ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೋ ಕೆಟ್ಟದ್ದೋ ನಾನು ಆ ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯೂ ನೂ ಅವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಏಕೆ ಅವರು ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಯಿತು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವನ್ನು ವಿಮರ್ಶನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಬೇರೆ

ಮುಂತ್ರಿಮುಂಡಲವನ್ನು ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಆ ಮುಂತ್ರಿಮುಂಡಲದಿಂದ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಯತೇ ಅಥವಾ ಆಗದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯುಂಟಾಗಿ ಅವರಿಗೂ ಮುಂತ್ರಿ ಮುಂಡಲಕ್ಕೂ ಏನಾದರೂ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಬಂತೇ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯ ಅಥವಾ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಅಲ್ಲೋಲ ಕಲ್ಲೋಲವಾಯಿತು ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರಿಂದ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ನೇಮಕವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹೊಸ ಮುಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಹಿಂದೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮುಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಕೆಲವು ಮುಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಲಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ದೇಶ ಮತ್ತು ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ. ಹಕ್ಕಿದೆ ಇದು ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ, ಏಕೆ ಹೀಗಾಯಿತು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಮೂಲಕ ನಾನು ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರ ಮುಂತ್ರಿ ಮುಂಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—On a point of order. I would like to know under what rules this discussion is going on. There is no rule which provides for a discussion of this type.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all everything.....

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—If the Hon'ble Speaker is going to give a ruling on the point of order raised, I would like the Chair to give an opportunity to the members on this side to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Minister wants to know how such discussion could take place and under what rule.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—There is no question of discussion or anything like that. What my Hon'ble friend wants is that a convention should be set up, and whether the other side is prepared to set up any convention. Therefore, no point of order arises. If there is any substantial motion before the House, then the question of point of order arises. If they are not prepared to set up any such convention, then there is an end of the matter.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I do not know why the members of the treasury bench are so touchy about this matter. You may remember, Sir, that in the Lok Sabha, it is a practice for the Minister who resigns to make a statement. A Minister in the Central Government has the right, with the permission of the Speaker, to make a statement explaining the circumstances which culminated in his resignation. That, I consider, is a healthy convention. We, on this side of the House, are trying to build up such healthy democratic conventions. It is with that object, the Leader of the Opposition has brought up this matter. It is very necessary and perhaps desirable in the interest of democratic traditions that a statement like that should be made by the treasury benches. We are all fully aware of the almost dramatic manner in which the House was adjourned *sine die* when we were discussing the Mysore Village Panchayats and District Boards Bill. At that time, the Agenda was put down for a few more days and we all thought that the discussion would continue. But the sessions came to an abrupt end, without any reasons being assigned therefor. I think it is a duty cast upon the members of the treasury benches to let us know the circumstances which led to this kind of disaster, *viz.*, the abrupt ending of the then Cabinet of Ministers. Further, it should not be forgotten that Sri Jatti, who is now the Leader of the House, is not merely the leader of the Congress party but the leader of the House. We have not been given an opportunity to welcome him formally. It is very unfortunate that we have not been given an opportunity to welcome him and his colleagues.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no convention to welcome the Ministers in the Assembly.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—When a Cabinet is formed and when it goes out unceremoniously, you will agree that the issue involved is important. I think this House is entitled to know as a matter of right why the Cabinet resigned and a new Cabinet was ushered in. It is not a purely Ruling Party matter. I do not know if it was necessary on the part of the Governor himself to have made a statement as to why the previous Cabinet resigned and a new Cabinet came in. Apart from this, Sir, whatever the rule is, I would like to go a step further and say that in the interest of democraitc traditions it is necessary for the Chief

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

Minister or any of his colleagues to make a statement in this House. May I ask if there is valid or conscientious objection to a statement being made ?

3-30 P.M.

*Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Minister for Public Works).—I fail to under stand why our friends on the opposite side are so anxious to confer upon themselves a right which the statute does not confer.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point is not that the Opposition members want to know why the Minister resigning has not chosen to make a statement. They want to establish a convention in this House that the whole House is entitled to know under what circumstances the previous ministry resigned.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I would like to bring to the notice of the Speaker and also the members that it is not merely a matter of convention, but a rule has been laid down. So where a specific rule in this behalf is already there, there is no question of a convention being there. The rule says that in the case of a Minister resigning it is left to his discretion whether to make a statement or not and where a specific rule has been laid down, conferring the right on the Minister resigning either to make a statement or not, I fail to understand my honourable friends saying that there is no convention at all, that there is no rule at all and things of the kind.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You do not seem to have understood the points. There are two points. One point is that the Minister who resigns must come and make a statement. That is the first point raised. The second is, when the whole Cabinet goes out, whether the House is entitled to know why it has gone out.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I would like to clarify the position by reading Rule 118. This Rule says:—

"(1) A member who has resigned the office of Minister may, with the consent of the Speaker, make a personal statement in explanation of his resignation.

"(2) Such statement shall be made after questions and before the list of business for the day is entered upon.

"(3) On such statement no debate shall be allowed:

"Provided that a Minister shall be entitled, after such member has made his statement, to make a statement pertinent thereto."

This makes it very clear about leaving the choice whether to make a statement or not to make a statement, to the Minister resigning.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Channabasappa is trying to make out a case that it is for the resigning Minister to come and make a statement and that if he does not make a statement there is an end of the matter. The other point is whether this House is entitled, when the whole Cabinet goes out, to know the circumstances under which it went out. That is a point on which I want light from the Hon'ble Members.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ (ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಹಿಂದೆ ಕೂಡ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳಾದವು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಯಾವ ಕನ್ವೆನ್‌ಷನ್ನುಗಳೂ ಇದ್ದಂತೆ ಕಂಡುಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಸಿ. ರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ಬಂದಿತು. ಅದಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯನವರ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ಬಂದಿತು. ಅನಂತರ ಶ್ರೀ ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪನವರ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ಬಂದಿತು ಆದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯನವರಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಶ್ರೀ ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪನವರಾಗಲಿ ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ಸ್ಟೇಟುಮೆಂಟನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅನಂತರ ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್‌ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ಕೂಡ ಬಂದಿತ್ತು.

Neither Sri Manjappa or Sri Hanumenthaiya did make a statement.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Nijalingappa came twice, but he went out only once.

Sri G. SIVAPPA—Sri Mallaradhya was pleased to say that we were very touchy. In fact, we are not touchy. They themselves are touchy. These are days of democracy. There is no such convention that if a Minister goes out, he should make a statement. Why should they worry over this small thing?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—So far as the position with respect to Rule 118 is concerned, what the P.W.D. Minister has said is

correct. I feel that if the Minister resigning chooses to make a statement, he is entitled to do so; otherwise, there is no necessity. But our point is that even a Minister resigning has a duty cast on him, so far as this House in concerned, to make a statement explaining, if there is any explanation needed, the circumstances under which he has resigned. There must be some statement made. That is the first point.

The second point is, according to my impression, Rule 118 gives discretion to a Minister when it is a case of only one minister resigning from a cabinet. There is nothing laid down in the rules as to making a statement where the entire Cabinet goes out. Supposing one of the Ministers resigns. He can make a statement. When Sri. T. Siddalingaiya resigned, I think he did make a statement.

(SOME HON'BLE MEMBERS.—He did not.)

I have got a ruling from the Bombay Assembly where similar statements have been made. In Orissa there is a ruling in this respect. Recently there is an example in Bengal Assembly. Generally, there is such a convention. I do not know how Sri. G. Sivappa says that there is no such convention. In the case of Sri Nijalingappa, after the elections this is the first time he is going out. Where the whole Cabinet goes out, there should be a convention that the circumstances leading thereto, whether by resignation or by no confidence motion, in whatever manner it might be, should be made known to the House by way of a statement. It is absolutely necessary that some sort of a statement is made and the House is apprised of the facts. I may also submit that there may be an apprehension on the other side that the statement may be subject to any discussion. The Speaker can rule that such a statement made by the Minister or the Leader of the House is not a matter subject to discussion. It is only a statement made for the information of the House. There is no question of any discussion. In this case, the Cabinet itself has gone out. It is not that one Minister has gone out.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY (Bangalore South).—I would like to know from the Chair whether it is the intention of the Chair that a statement should be demanded from the Ministers that have gone out of office.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Here I want to correct the Hon'ble Member. It is not my intention that the Ministers who have resigned should now make a statement. We are only thinking whether there is such a convention that the Minister resigning must make a statement. That is one point. The second point is: when the whole Cabinet goes out, is it not necessary or is it not the convention that the House is entitled to know why it has gone out?

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—The point is clear. If the Ministers that have gone out of office offer to make a statement, then it is open to the House to consider the proposition and permit them to make a statement. The position is that none of them has come forward, offering to make a statement. As I could understand the Chair, the Chair also is not clear about the situation, because whether it amounts to a convention or otherwise is a thing that the House is considering now. I wish to know whether in a parliamentary democracy where on a matter pertaining to the party that is in power, its affairs are discussed on the floor of the Assembly like this and I want to know from the members of the Opposition whether they have instances to cite of statements being made under such circumstances in any other Legislature in the country. But so far as my information goes, I see that no such statement is made in any of the Legislatures in the country. Here, our friends are urging for the estalishment of a peculiar convention, namely, that a statement by the Ministry which has gone out should be called for on the floor of the House. If the Ruling Party changes the Ministry for valid reasons of its own, it is not the concern of this House. I think it is not a healthy convention to be set up and such a request should

(SRI A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY)

not be conceded. Secondly, as pointed out by the Hon'ble Minister Sri Channabasappa, under the Rules of Procedure it is only when a Minister resigns from the continuing Cabinet that he makes a statement if he chooses to do so. The circumstances with which we are faced at present do not warrant such a statement to be expected by this House. Therefore my contention is that it would be neither healthy nor proper to allow such a statement to be made.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore city).—Sir, a demand is made that a statement should be made.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are two demands.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—The Opposition demands that the outgoing Ministry should make a statement as a matter of convention.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Mysore).—Is it the establishment of a convention or the following of a convention?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is a moot point.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I never made a demand. I only wanted to draw the attention of the House to the fact that such a convention exists. If it does not exist, it is for the other members to say that there is no such convention. But to say that there is a demand on our behalf is not proper.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—From the discussion that has gone on I thought that the Opposition wanted to establish a convention in this behalf at least for future guidance. To my knowledge there is no convention of the kind demanded by the Opposition. Of course, it is in the fitness of things that a Minister going out or a Ministry going out makes a statement voluntarily. Supposing they do not choose to make a statement, there is no convention under which such a statement could be demanded from them. Secondly, so far as I could see, such a convention of demanding a statement, that too after a lapse of nearly six months, does not exist anywhere on the face of the earth. If a Minister resigns or if a whole Cabinet goes out before the House adjourns, the Minister so reigning may make a statement explaining the reasons which led to his resignation. Another point to be borne in mind is that with the change in the personnel of the Ministry, the policy of the Government has not changed. Such stantements are also made on occasions when the policy of Government is changed. Here, I may assure my friends that the policy laid down will be followed for the rest of the term.

Dr. T. PARTHASARATHY (Malleswaram).—What is that policy?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Policy statements are made by the Treasury Benches from time to time. Therefore, so far as having a convention in this behalf for the future is concerned, it does not call for a ruling at all because under the Rules of Procedure, such a kind of discussion is not permitted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the Hon'ble Member mean to say that the Rules of Procedure cover conventions also? So far as I am aware, they are not covered by the Rules of Procedure.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—That is so. Wherever there are no rules laid down, conventions are followed, but there is no convention under which such a demand could be made and so let not such a demand be made every time in future.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—I rise to a point of order, Sir. It is not a demand.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is not a point of order.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—That is a point of order. I shall explain the position. ಅವರು ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾವು ಕೇಳುವುದು ಅದಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿರುವ 208 ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಎರಡು ಕೋಟಿ ಪ್ರಜಾನಂಜ್ಯೆ ಅರಿಸಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಅರ್ಥ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So far as I have been able to gather from the Hon'ble Member, there is no point of order. What you want to say is that you are not demanding a convention. So far as I can understand, nobody can demand a convention. Convention can be established only by mutual consent.

ಶ್ರೀಜಿ. ಎಚ್. ವೀರಣ್ಣ.—ಅವರು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಎನ್ನುವ ಪದವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆಯಬೇಕು.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Maddur).—Sir, since the question is likely to take some time, we may take it up after lunch.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is a very good suggestion.

The House will now rise and reassemble after half an hour.

The House adjourned at Fifty Minutes past Three of the Clock and reassembled at Twenty Minutes past Four of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Sir, before the House rose, I was speaking about conventions. Very lately, there was a change of Government in England. That is the place where great conventions are established and observed. If my memory is correct, even there statements were not made on a change of Government. So what I was unable to understand was whether there were at all any precedents for a discussion of this kind. To my mind, there are none and, therefore, without taking much time of this House I would submit that the request or the demand made by the Leader of the Opposition for a statement on a particular point does not arise at this distance of time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble the Chief Minister.

(*Several Members rose.*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the Chief Minister is standing. After he makes his statement, if members have any fresh points to urge, I will give them a chance.

Sri M. RAMAPPA (Harihara).—We want that we should be given a chance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We are discussing certan points here. The first point is whether the Ministers who have resigned should make a statement. The second point is whether this House is entitled to know why the Cabinet resigned *en bloc*. These are the two points and the Chief Minister is going to state his own views in this connection. He is not going to make a substantial statement; he is only going to deal with these two points.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Ramanagaram).—I want to know whether there would be further discussion after the Leader of the House states his opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It will not be correct for me to give chance to other members after the Chief Minister makes his statement. After that, if, however, any member says that he has some fresh points to urge, I would like to give him a chance. In this case I think the Chief Minister is going to give the considered opinion of himself, and, I suppose, of the Cabinet. After that, the other members will have an opportunity to say what they feel if they have any fresh points in that respect.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—May I submit through you that we have to follow certain well-known conventions in regard to the procedure we adopt in discussing matters of such vital importance. As soon as the Leader of the Opposition raises a point of such a nature, it is the Leader of the House that will state what is the correct convention on the subject. Usually, the discussion closes there. When we work party systems, it is a basic factor that the Leader of the Opposition speaks for the Opposition and the Leader of the House speaks not merely for the party of which he is the leader, but for the whole House. So, to carry on discussion thereafter would be to detract from the dignity that is attached to these two offices. May be that we have not been following this healthy convention for some time, but I would appeal to the House and to you in particular that these two offices must be raised in the eyes not only of this House but also of the public. It is presumed that their statements are so authoritative that ordinarily speaking we do not controvert or challenge them. Here, in this particular instance, as you rightly observed some time earlier, we want to lay down a convention. It is not so much a question of giving

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA)

a ruling. It is a question of mutual consent. No two offices are better suited for coming to an understanding in the matter of establishing a convention than these two offices. If, after the Leader of the Opposition speaks, everybody on his side begins to speak on the same subject, then the same performance will be repeated on this side of the House also. This is the first time that this question has arisen. According to your judgment you may allow some members to participate in the debate. But after the Leader of the House has given his opinion, then the situation will be ripe for you to give your opinion and close the discussion.

4-30 P.M.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—A very important point has been raised by the Hon'ble Member Sri Hanumanthaiya in the matter because . . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all what the Hon'ble Member Sri Hanumanthaiya has said is for the guidance of the House and the guidance of the Chair. In fact I am inclined to agree with him. The ideal stage would be for the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the House to make statements and then a ruling should be given. That would be ideal. But it has been my experience that after the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the House speaks some Hon'ble Members are tempted to speak and they do not keep quiet. They assert themselves and it will be impossible for me to curb them. It is a matter of internal party discipline that when the Leader of the Opposition speaks other members should not speak and it is also for the party in power to observe the rule that as soon as the Leader of the party speaks other members should not as far as possible speak. That would be really ideal. But it is not observed. I do not think it has been observed elsewhere also. There ought to be a sort of restraint. But I find that Hon'ble Members are not exercising as much restraint as they ought to in the matter. What to do? That is why I appeal to the members that if they have any fresh point they may approach me in my chamber and I will consider that point also and give a ruling. I am not going to give any ruling today. After hearing the Leader of the House I would like to reserve the ruling. I would like to give a considered ruling after going through the records of the House of Commons and the other Legislatures in India.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA. (Holenarasipur).—Before the Leader of the House gives his opinion, I think it is the desire of some of the members on this side to be given an opportunity.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am handicapped, Sri Veerappa. If every member of a certain party speaks it will be very difficult for me. It must either be left to the leader or to one of the members of the party to speak. Otherwise it will be difficult for me because we have to take into consideration the limitation of time. I have also made it clear that no member's viewpoint will be brushed aside.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I just wish to make a few observations regarding a point that has been raised on the floor of this House in regard to conventions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have given my idea.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I am not commenting against the Speaker's view at all. My point is this. My friend Sri Hanumanthaiya has raised a point that when the Leader of the Opposition speaks or the Leader of the House speaks nobody should speak. In an ideal state of affairs in a Parliamentary Democracy where the Two Party system is functioning very effectively, this would indeed be a very desirable thing. But, when an opportunity was specifically given by the Speaker for clarification on certain points, when a matter is thrown open for discussion, no disrespect is meant either to the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the House and there should be no suggestion whatsoever that the dignity of the House is not likely to be maintained if members of the Ruling party or even of the

Opposition express their own individual views. There should, therefore, be no wrong impression carried in the minds of either the members of the Opposition or of the other side. The point is clear. It is made to appear that we on this side of the House and some on that side are lacking in discipline. It is not that. None of us, at least me, is anxious to hear his own voice. But when the Speaker wanted light to be thrown on the issue raised on the floor of the House, every member has the privilege to express his views unreservedly. This is a matter which has come up afresh on the floor of this House. There is no precedent. It is on account of this only that some of us wanted to speak. The point raised by Sri Hanumanthaiya is too elementary and all of us individually and collectively know it and follow it usually.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You have made yourself very clear. There is no use arguing on the point of the Hon'ble Member Sri Hanumanthaiya. He said what is best under the circumstances. In fact I agree with him that we should try to have in this Assembly as much an ideal state of affairs as possible. We have not reached that stage as yet but we must try our level best that when we go on discussing matters we must have restraint.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—But how often has the Leader of the House taken us, I mean the opposition members, into confidence even in matters where major policies are initiated? We are talking of healthy conventions in the House of Commons, and when it comes to following them up, we hesitate and do nothing.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You are treading on another path altogether. We are here on a certain point where we have to establish if we can certain conventions. But the point that you want to raise is outside the purview of the present subject matter. I would like to say one point. If the members of the Assembly agree we could have a code of conduct. That would save us from all this trouble. In fact a suggestion has come from one of the members to call for a conference of the kind wherein we sit together and evolve a code of conduct.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

You wanted that the members should throw some light on this. That is why members rose to speak; otherwise if you had given a suggestion that after the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition the Leader of the House would make a statement, we would not have risen. It is only after your suggestion . . .

Mr SPEAKER.—You cannot take me to task like that. (*Laughter*) What is the use of throwing the same light?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—It is not the same light.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I tell you it is the same light. I have already said that if there is any fresh point to be urged by a member he would be given a chance and he will see me in my chambers.

(*Sri Y. Veerappa rose*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will have to be very strict. After the Chief Minister makes a statement we will close the chapter.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—Mr. Speaker, two points have been urged in the discussion carried on so far. Point one is, whether a Minister after he resigns should make a statement or not. For that there is a clear rule—Rule No. 118 to the effect that if a Minister who has resigned wants to make a statement he may make a personal statement. But that situation has not arisen today. As regards the other point, that if there is a change in the Ministry itself, the Ministry should make a statement, we have not got any instance in this State. We have got instances in foreign countries. But there are several instances in the country where Ministries have been changed but at that time nowhere either the incoming Ministry or the outgoing Ministry has made any statement. There is no convention either here or in any other State—at least in this country. When there is no convention it is not necessary for this House to lay down a new convention or to establish a new convention. So

(SRI B. D. JATTI)

I request all the members not to establish a new convention and start asking the Ministers who come for the first time to make statements.

One more point, Sir. According to article 164 of the Constitution, "the Chief Minister shall be appointed by the Governor and the other Ministers shall be appointed by the Governor on the advice of the Chief Minister, and the Ministers shall hold office during the pleasure of the Governor." It is the Governor who appoints the Leader of the Party as the Chief Minister, who has to give his advice to the Governor to form the Ministry. It is not the House which appoints the Leader of the House. Therefore that question does not arise.

(*A number of Hon'ble Members rose.*)

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble the Chief Minister has made a statement. If there are any doubts, let the Hon'ble Members come and see me in my chambers.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, I am raising a point of privilege, and it is this. When Sri Muckannappa wanted a clarification from the Leader of the House, the Hon'ble Speaker was pleased to say—in a way he was not pleased to permit. I make a very humble submission that it is the right of the members to seek clarification. While seeking clarifications, we are not entitled to comment on the statement made by either the Leader of the House or any other member. Sir, Sri Muckannappa was trying to exercise his right for asking a clarification. I make an humble suggestion that the Speaker may kindly permit him to seek clarification. Suppose if the Hon'ble Speaker were to hold that it is within his right to allow members either to seek clarification or not, then we will be setting a dangerous precedent. I am not suggeting that this case should be treated as an exception. Sri Muckannappa should be given permission to seek clarification and the caution is while seeking clarification, we cannot give vent to our opinions. That is my point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER.—I would like to know whether it is the opinion of the Hon'ble Member that Sri Muckannappa should be allowed to seek clarification or that other members also should be allowed to seek clarification.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, if there is a relevant point on which any member wants a clarification, he has to be allowed. Suppose we misuse our right, the Speaker has got every right to ask us to resume our seats. I am sure that the Hon'ble Members of this House know their responsibility and they would not waste the time of this House unnecessarily. You will have to trust us and give us an opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER.—Of course, the Speaker has to trust the members and the members have to trust the Speaker. It is not a one-way traffic .....

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—If the Hon'ble Speaker has understood me to mean that it is one-way traffic, I apologise.

MR. SPEAKER.—I do not mean that. I did not mean that the Hon'ble Member is saying in that way. I only say that it should be a two-way traffic. I have no objection if it is a clear question of clarification. But I will not allow any member making a speech under the cover of clarification. It must be purely a matter of clarification on one point. The clarificatinn should be put in a very simple and straightforward way and no speech should be made.

SRI B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—I also have one point.....

MR. SPEAKER.—If it applies to Sri Muckannappa, it applies to you also.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾನು ಕ್ಲೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿವರಣೆ ಇಷ್ಟೇ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ನಾಯಕರನ್ನು ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದರು, ನಾಯಕರ ಶಿಫಾರಿಸಿನಮೇಲೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡ ರಾಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ತಾನೇ ತಾನಾಗಿ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿತೋ ಅಥವಾ ಅದನ್ನೂ ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರು ರದ್ದುಮಾಡಿದರೋ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಯಾರ ವಿಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ? ತಾವು ಕೇಳತಕ್ಕ ವಿವರಣೆಯೇ ಇದು ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I want to know whether the Ministry was dismissed by the Governor or the Ministry *suo moto* voluntarily resigned.

Sri B.N. BORANNA GOWDA (Belur).—Is it a point for clarification, Sir ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not want any other member to interfere in this matter. If there is to be clarification I will allow. I have also stated that the members on this side should give the Chief Minister a chance to reply. If they go on like this, they will not only be doing injustice to the House, but they will also be doing injustice to the Leader of the House.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಎ. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ (ಕುಣಿಗಲ್).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನೊಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರೇ ನೊಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನೆತ್ತಿದರೋ ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯನವರೇನು ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೋ ಅವುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾಳೆ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ತಾವೊಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಕೊಡುವುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದಮೇಲೆ ಈಗ ಪುನಃ ಅದೇ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಾವು ನಾಳೆ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡೋಣವೆಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ನಾಳೆ ಕೇಳಬೇಕೇ ಹೊರತು ಈಗ ಕೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಒಬ್ಬರು ಕೇಳಿದಮೇಲೆ ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರು ಕೇಳಿಯೆ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಇದೊಂದು ನರಿಯಾದ ರೀತಿನೀತಿಯಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You are trying to put your own interpretation or questioning my ruling. After hearing Sri Puttaswamy, I have thought it better that if some point for clarification arises in this House, it should be replied. Therefore, what is the use of going back as the Hon'ble Member is trying to do ? If it is the opinion of the Hon'ble Member that I ought not to allow, it is all right. But what is the use of questioning my ruling.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಎನ್. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ.—ಯಾವ ವಿಚಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಉದ್ಭವವಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಅದೇ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಈಗ ಅವರು ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಎಂಬ ಬೇರೆ ಹೆಸರಿನಿಂದ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Law, Labour and Local Self-Government).—I wish to intervene in the debate. Under the guise of clarification, Sri Muckannappa is putting a question asking for a statement as to how this Ministry came in and how the other Ministry went out. This is not a point for clarification and no answer can be given because we stand upon our right.

*Sri M. RAMAPPA (Harihara).—On a point of order. The Speaker was pleased to call upon the Chief Minister to make a statement and reply to the clarfication put by Sri Muckannappa. It is not open to the Minister for Local Self-Government to say that it is not proper to call the Chief Minister. The Speaker has already called for the Chief Minister to make the clarification. Now he is challenging the ruling of the Speaker.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I am so sorry that my learned friend sitting in front of me thinks that I am out of order in standing up to speak a few words when the Chief Minister was called upon to clarify. I am here to say that that is no clarification to be sought and no clarification can be given on that point.

Sri U M. MADAPPA (Chamarajanagar).—The Chair has allowed that.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I have a right to say that it is not a clarification at all, and no answer can be given on that point.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಶ್ರೀ ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ ಏನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಬಿಡುವುದು ಅವರ ಇಚ್ಛೆ. ಅವರು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು, ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ. I cannot compel anybody to reply. ಏನಾದರೂ ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಅವರ ಮರ್ಜಿ ಮತ್ತು ಇಚ್ಛೆ. ನಾನು ಅವರನ್ನು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಲಾರೆ.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—Just now you have asked the Leader of the House to reply.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—How many times you are going to stand up ? ಪ್ರತಿಸಲ ತಾವೇ ಏಳುವುದು ಕೂರುವುದು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಇನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರೂ ಏಳಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಶ್ರೀ ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯನವರು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಬಿಡುವುದು ಅವರ ಇಷ್ಟ. If anybody wants to ask for clarification, it is for the Treasury Benches to reply or not.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Whoever wants clarification may all say what they want and the Chief Minister may kindly note them and give a reply

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

once and for all. Instead of cross-examination, he may be asked to note down all points for clarifications and give his reply to them once and for all if he likes.

*Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—Now shall I ask the clarification? ಕೇಳುವುದು ಬೇಡ ಎಂದರೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾವುದನ್ನೂ ಕೇಳಬೇಡಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಏಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನೇ ಪುನಃ ಕೇಳಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ನಾನು ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾನು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಲಿ. ಅದು ನನ್ನ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈಗತಾನೆ ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಗವರ್ನರ್‌ಅವರು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಅಪಾಯಿಂಟ್‌ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಲೀಡರ್ ಅವರ ನಲಹೆಯಮೇರೆ ಇತರ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಅಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದವರ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಗವರ್ನರ್ ರವರು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ಈಗ ತಾವು ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಲೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಈಗ ನಮಗೆ ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಮಾರ್ಗ ಇದೆ? ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಲೀಡರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದವರ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಗವರ್ನರ್‌ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರು? ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ, ನಮಗೆ ಲೀಡರ್‌ಅವರು ಗವರ್ನರ್‌ಅವರನ್ನು ಕನ್‌ಸಲ್ಟ್‌ಮಾಡಿ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವೇ ಗವರ್ನರ್‌ಅವರನ್ನು ಕನ್‌ಸಲ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವರು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರು.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—I would like to raise a point of order. I have been very patiently going through the Rules of Procedure. I would like to know under what provision are we going to intervene in the business of this House by calling it a clarification. I want to know where and under what provision. Is it a convention that we are following or is it under any particular rule that these clarifications are sought? My respectful submission is this: if it is a convention, it is up to you once and for all to decide the issue. With regard to this way of clarification, I see only one rule and that is rule 149 which reads thus:

"A member may, with the permission of the Speaker, make a personal explanation although there is no question before the Assembly but in this case no debatable matter may be brought forward, and no debate shall arise."

Barring this provision, unless there is a particular business there is no other clause under which we can interrupt the business of this House; this question of clarification is something about which I have looked into the May's Procedure and I do not find it anywhere. We are spending quite a lot of time of this august House and we are going on with clarification which I do not find in any part of the Parliamentary procedure. My point of order is that a point of clarification cannot be raised before this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Unfortunately, points of orders are raised on points which have been accepted by this House. When a certain subject is being discussed in the House, a member is right in asking for clarification or personal explanation. If any Hon'ble Member asks for a clarification or any member of the Treasury Benches makes a personal explanation, it is not objected to. I have been given to understand that it has been established in this House from the time of its very inception that a member may get up and ask for clarification on the subject which is being discussed. It is not necessary to go to May's Parliamentary Procedure, nor is it necessary to go into the Rules of Procedure. I have already said that the Rules of Procedure are not exhaustive and cannot be exhaustive. We have accepted many more things and the Rules of Procedure have allowed all of them. Any subject in which a member feels like establishing conventions or healthy traditions may be discussed. We are an infant democracy and we have yet to evolve afirm sort of parliamentary democracy. In that respect I would hold that though our Bible is the Rules of Procedure, it is not exhaustive. Many a time, the Hon'ble Member who has raised this point of order, himself has asked many clarifications and I do not understand

why he should take objection today when other members ask for clarifications. Anyhow, I am of opinion that the members will bear with me when I point out that certain matters which have been established and taken for granted should not be questioned. I can only make an appeal in this respect. I cannot shut out members from raising points of orders. They have a right to raise points of order, but points of order on matters which have been long established or taken for granted, may not be raised again.

5 P. M.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—My clarification is this, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—All clarifications may be replied.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—The Hon'ble Minister was pleased to say that Rule 118 has no application. I want to know whether the General Clauses Act does not say that singular includes plural and Minister includes Ministers ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಎಕ್. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ.—ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ರಾಜಿನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರಿಗಿಲ್ಲವೆ ? ಲೀಡರ್ ಅವರು ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವೇ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದು ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದಲ್ಲೇ ಇದೆ.

(*Sri B. K. Puttaramiya rose.*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to make a last appeal to you Sri. Puttaramiya, that you please bear with me.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—I am so sorry Mr. Speaker, I am obeying the Chair on all occasions and will continue to do so. In spite of that, I do not know why the Chair is always on me.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No, I am not always on you. You are on me.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಎಕ್. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ.—ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರಮಾಡಿ, ಬೇರೆಯವರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಲು ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಲ್ಲವೆ ? ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ 'ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್' ಕೇಳುವ ಅಗತ್ಯ ವೇನಿದೆ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಏನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ? ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Let us close this chapter. Has the Hon'ble the Chief Minister anything to say ?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—According to me Sir, no point was raised on which there was any necessity to give clarification. The point is very clear. I have made it very clear that there is no convention either in this country or elsewhere when a Ministry has made any statement. So, I think it does not require any clarification.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—I want to know how long we are going to sit.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We are sitting up to seven.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE.

(i) Ordinances.

Sri K. F. PATIL (Minister for Agriculture and Food).—I beg to lay on the table "the Madras Commercial Crops Markets (Mysore Amendment and Validation of Levy of Cess) Ordinance, 1958;

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—I beg to lay on the Table (1) the Mysore Tenancy Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 1958;

(2) the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection (Mysore Amendment) Ordinance, 1958.

Sri MALI MARIAPPA (Minister for Co-operation).—I beg to lay on the Table the Hyderabad Co-operative Societies (Mysore Amendment) Ordinance, 1958.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Law, Labour and Local Self-Government).—I beg to lay on the Table the Madras Area Municipalities (Extension of Term of Councillors) Ordinance, 1958.

(ii) Notifications.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—I beg to lay on the Table the following notifications :—

Notification No. HD. 168 MVT. 57, dated 1st May 1958;
Notification No. HD. 22 (a) MVT. 58, dated 2nd May 1958,
Notification No. HD. 38 TST. 57, dated 17th May 1957,
Notification No. HD. 5 MVT. 58, dated 2nd June 1958,
Notification No. HD. 45 MVT. 58, dated 31st May 1958,